

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California**

**CIVIL MINUTES**

**Date:** August 23, 2022

**Time:** 2:51 - 3:51  
60 Minutes

**Judge:** EDWARD M. CHEN

<b>Case No.:</b> 21-cv-01143-EMC 22-cv-00928-EMC 22-cv-01810-EMC 22-cv-01809-EMC 22-cv-02098-EMC 22-cv-01995-EMC 22-cv-02421-EMC 22-cv-02441-EMC 22-cv-02727-EMC 22-cv-03627-EMC	<b>Case Name:</b> Sausalito/Marin County Chapter CA Homeless v. City of Sausalito (21-1143) Philip Deschamps v. City of Sausalito (22-928) Haley Allen v. City of Sausalito (22-1810) Robbie Powelson v City of Sausalito (22-1809) Jennifer Moffit v City of Sausalito (22-2098) Arthur Bruce v City of Sausalito (22-1995) Jeff Chase v City of Sausalito (22-2421) Ryan Tuttle v Zapata et al. (22-2441) Speary v. City of Sausalito (22-2727) Worthen v. City of Sausalito (22-3627)
---	--

**Attorney for Plaintiffs:** Anthony Prince

**Pro Se Plaintiff(s):** Robbie Powelson, Arthur Bruce, Mechel Barron, Jeff Chase, Philip Deschamps

**Attorneys for Defendants:** Alexander Merritt, Nick Sherman (Urban Alchemy in Worthen Only)

**Attorney for Defendant (Pro Se cases):** Arthur Gaus

**Deputy Clerk:** Vicky Ayala

**Court Reporter:** Marla Knox

**PROCEEDINGS**

Further Case Management Conference – held.

**SUMMARY**

Parties stated appearances.

Parties reached a settlement agreement in the main case, and the Homeless Union is in the process of gathering signatures and releases from the participating individuals. The Union currently has about 25 signatures out of the 30 individuals included in the agreement. Under the agreement, they have until September 1, 2022, to receive the releases.

Both the Union and the City indicated that they were interested in having the County participate in discussing longer term solutions to the housing situation. The Union was provided a contact for the County housing coordinator but has not been able to schedule a meeting. The Court hopes the County will cooperate

Court heard from pro se individuals Deschamps and Powelson. Bruce, Chase and Barron also attended. Concerns were raised regarding the scope of the agreement, such as who was included in the agreement and which claims would be waived by signing the agreement (*e.g.*, claims of police misconduct). Court reminded parties that Judge Illman has been delegated the authority under the settlement agreement to interpret and implement the agreement and resolve disputes surrounding the agreement should go to him. Court further reminded Parties that claims of individuals not included in the agreement or claims that fall outside the agreement can still be brought to Judge Illman's attention. Both individuals stated that they would appreciate Judge Illman's help in resolving the interpretation and implementation issues. After hearing from Deschamps and Powelson, Court decided to not take further action or comments until the settlement agreement is consummated and more information is known regarding signatures and the status of the distribution of financial assistance.

The City indicated that they may move to dissolve some of the outstanding temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions. Court suggested that the City wait until after the Status Conference on October 11, 2022, before filing such motions. Additionally, Court reminded the City that there are constitutional restraints on imposing criminal sanction on unhoused individuals who do not have any place to go.

**Further Case Management Conference is scheduled for October 11, 2022, at 2:30, p.m. Joint Status Report due by October 4, 2022.**